

E 672  
.C22  
Copy 2

Cannon, Joseph G.

Ulysses S. Grant, the  
Modest, Courageous Man, the  
Normal American.





Class E 812

Book 1875

PRESENTED BY





SPEECH OF HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON.

Mr. CRANE presented the following

**SPEECH OF HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON BEFORE THE MIDDLESEX CLUB, BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, APRIL 30, 1910, ON "ULYSSES S. GRANT, THE MODEST, COURAGEOUS MAN, THE NORMAL AMERICAN."**

MAY 26, 1910.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Toastmaster and gentlemen of the Middlesex Club, I never read but one speech in my life and would not undertake to read my remarks to-night to an audience of 3,000 people, but I am reminded as I look into your faces of an occurrence out on the Wabash before most of you were born. The place, a little country general store where everything was sold from mackerel and tar to silk and prints; boy of all work, deputy postmaster, 17 years old, the individual who now addresses you. It was a farming community, before the day of railways. Markets were down the Wabash, down the Ohio, down the Mississippi, on flatboats. The man or boy who had floated down the Mississippi on a flatboat, when he returned on the little stern-wheel steamer, was a traveled gentleman, looked up to in the community.

One cold winter day a man, not a relative of your Senator Crane, but a man by the name of Crane, came into the little establishment and said, "Is there any mail for me?" I passed back to the place where the mail was kept. It was before the day of post-office boxes. I gave him three letters and two or three papers. This Mr. Crane lived by traveling, generally walking, although sometimes a farmer would give him a lift, and he would go 10 miles, 20, 60, or 100 miles, to give talks which he called lectures, the compensation which he received being all the way from \$5, and on special occasions, \$10. This being a very cold day, he rubbed his hands as he went back to the red-hot box stove around which were five or six farmers, among them Aaron Merris. He opened one letter, and as he rubbed his hands he said, "Ah!" "What's the matter, Crane?" said Uncle Merris. "An invitation from Boston to lecture. I wonder if I had better accept it?" "Of course you had," said Aaron Merris. "Of course you had. I never did like them Boston men." [Applause.]

To-night for the second time in my life I am going to crave the indulgence of my audience while I read. What I may do before I sit down I do not know, because I have the birthright in Friends' meet-

ings, you know, of being moved by the spirit as it is given. [Laughter and applause.]

One of the weaknesses of age is the tendency to live in the past; but it is true that the contests of those who have gone before, their battles for correct policies in war and peace, their efforts to write those policies into legislation, their struggles against the counsels of the vicious, the ignorant, the selfish, and the demagogue, constitute a glorious history, show the timbre of the people who have preceded us, and furnish examples and experience by which we may profit in solving the problems that confront us to-day. Therefore, I make no apology for uniting with the Middlesex Club, a Republican club, in celebrating the birthday anniversary of Ulysses S. Grant.

In April, 1861, he was a clerk in his father's store in Galena. In April, 1865, he was the most famous military man in the world. In April, 1861, he presided at a Union meeting in a small Illinois town, unknown even to the majority of his neighbors; in April, 1865, he presided at that most famous Union meeting at Appomattox, when armed resistance to the Union ended. He had not come to this success and distinction through political favoritism or favorable publicity, unless we accept General Bragg's epigram on Grover Cleveland: "We love him for the enemies he made."

All the political generals and all the literary generals were opposed to Grant, and without friends in Washington and nothing but his record as he made it commending him, he went from one victory to another, compelling recognition until Lincoln placed him in command of all the Union armies before he had ever met or seen the man. General Sherman said every other general in the western army had his press agent with him, and while the newspaper accounts were necessarily confusing as to who were the real heroes, none of them gave Grant the credit; but the truth could not be kept from the Government and the people.

Almost up to the day of Lee's surrender there were severe criticisms of Grant and the country at times was compelled to doubt, as they read of him as a "butcher" needlessly sacrificing life, as a "drunkard" unfit to command troops, as a dull and commonplace man, utterly devoid of military genius; but somehow his work and the victories that followed him answered the criticism, and the men in the field and their friends at home waited with hope that he would succeed where others better advertised had failed.

#### NO HYSTERIA IN GRANT.

General Grant seems to have been a perfectly normal man. He had neither enthusiasm nor passion, and no hysterical development of any kind. He had no sense of the dramatic, and failed to do those things which instantly appeal to the public eye. He was so calm under all circumstances that he seems to have communicated some of his unexcitable nature to those about him, even to the horse he rode. Who ever heard of Grant on a prancing, rearing war horse? Why, even the artists who are ever looking for the dramatic and picturesque have always pictured Grant sitting quietly on a horse standing on four feet, as quietly as though just unhitched from the plow.

At Vicksburg Grant sent Logan into the city to take formal possession when Pemberton surrendered; at Appomattox he wore the ordi-

nary service uniform when he accepted Lee's surrender, and he could see no dramatic climax in the fall of the Confederacy, to be commemorated by his entering Lee's lines, or taking personal possession of Richmond. He hurried to Washington to arrange for disbanding the great armies under his command, and for sending the soldiers home to their families and friends and former occupations. This same indifference to dramatic demonstrations and situations followed him through life.

In his tour around the world he met crowned heads, statesmen, and plain people with the same simple manner. He surprised the Germans by walking from his hotel to the palace to call on Prince Bismarck, and the Prince, we are told, met him at the door instead of waiting to receive him in state. He met the Queen of England, the Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Japan, and the King of Siam in the same way, conforming to the etiquette of the court, but for himself never dropping the rôle of the plain American gentleman. He might have appeared in the courts of Europe and Asia wearing the four stars of a general, won in saving the Union, and by no man of right worn from Washington to his day, but he refused to appear in the uniform which gave him greatest distinction in the eyes of the world, and appeared ever and always as an American citizen.

#### THE CRITICS OF GRANT.

There is no better illustration of the fickleness and hysteria of critics and the undercurrent of steadfastness in the people than is found in the treatment of General Grant from the time he came on the national stage as a defender of the Union to the day of his death on Mount MacGregor. His critics could find no military genius, no patriotic devotion, and no moral courage in this man while he was fighting great battles, but after each and every victory they were forced to join in the chorus of approval that came from the great heart of the people. The critics condemned Grant at Paducah, at Corinth, at Donelson, at Vicksburg, at Chattanooga, in the Wilderness, and they kept the people who depended upon the public prints for information in a fever of unrest while the armies under Grant were fighting those battles, but the critics were forced to join in the approval "Well done, faithful servant," after the battles were won. The critics were bitter, unpromising, and even malicious, while President Grant's administration was working out the policy of reconstruction, but the people approved the work that was accomplished. The critics misrepresented the first citizen as he quietly encircled the globe with the modesty and dignity of an American gentleman, but the people gave Grant such a welcome on his return as had never before nor since been given to any man in America. The critics abused and villified Grant when, without his inspiration, his admirers sought to give him a third nomination, but the people showed their appreciation of his worth when he took his place in the ranks of the Republican party and gave his services to the election of General Garfield. The critics stripped the very soul of the man, robbed him of character even, when a characterless speculator robbed him and his family of their property, but the people cheered the dying soldier back to life as he labored with his pen to pay the debts that had been fraudulently placed against his name and fame, and when at last death conquered the man who had been invincible

before all human foes there was such a wave of sorrow and commendation from the people of all the world as had come up from humanity but once in our nation's history, when the hand of the assassin struck down Lincoln. But let us not be too hard on the critics. They are but the representatives of and vehicles for the outpourings of hysteria and the human frailty called "envy," that has been a part of man's nature since the expulsion from the Garden of Eden.

There is a legend that in the old Thuringian forests there used to be strange beings, a race of giants, more and less than men, who were considered by the Romans as horrible beasts and by the Germans as divine incarnations, and who, according to the occasion, ran the risk of being exterminated or worshiped. So it was with this modest, unpretentious, undramatic soldier and statesman. He was hero to the people whom he served, but devil to those who looked on him only with envy.

Lincoln had a hundred brilliant geniuses criticising him and telling him what he ought to do, but Lincoln saved the Union without following their advice or heeding their criticism. Grant had a thousand men in and out of the army telling him how to take Vicksburg; but he followed his own plan evolved there on the ground and won. So it has been throughout our history, and so it will be to the end. Ours is a representative government, and the men who administer it must be representative of the people, not of one class or occupation; and while the critic has his place, he does very little to help make the wheels go round. He may get into the clouds and spread a mist of hazy talk about progressive ideas, or down in the mire throwing mud at everybody, but we need men who will keep on the level and deal with realities to work out definite plans.

#### REFUSED TO COMMEMORATE FALL OF CONFEDERACY.

General Grant refused to have the surrender at Appomattox commemorated in a historic painting representing him as receiving the sword of Lee, as is represented the surrender of Burgoyne to General Gates at Saratoga, in the great painting hung in the Rotunda of the National Capitol. In fact, he never touched the sword of Lee. In that refusal Grant not only illustrated his own character as a man whose whole contest had been the restoration of the Union, but his action typified the sentiment of the Republican party, then and now responsible for the conduct of the Government.

The Federal Government has never commemorated in monument or picture the fall of the confederacy. It never will. [Applause.] It has provided for the preservation of the most historic battlefields and there mingle the monuments to the heroism of both armies, but the policy of the Republican party has been for the benefit of the whole Union—North and South, East and West—and this policy has obliterated the scars of war more completely than any other policy could have done, for it has spread the industries once confined to New England over the South and West, and although New England has multiplied her industries many, many times, she has now but a minor percentage of the great industrial output of this country.

One artist, Emanuel Leutze, foreign-born, like so many of our people, has portrayed on canvas the spirit of the American people, and I am glad the Congress made that picture a conspicuous feature

of the decoration of the Capitol. It is labeled: "Westward the Course of Empire takes its Way," and it hangs over the landing of the main stairway in the House wing of the Capitol at Washington, where everyone must see it in going to the galleries of the House of Representatives. Some critics have said it is not a great artistic production, but to me it is the most inspiring picture I have ever seen, because it presents the real spirit that has made this the greatest nation on earth.

#### WESTWARD THE COURSE OF EMPIRE TAKES ITS WAY.

In the foreground of this great painting is depicted the struggles and privations of the early wagon train crossing a pass in the Rocky Mountains; beyond are the towering cliffs in the backbone of the continent, and in the distance are gushing geysers, grand canyons, and the idealization of an Eldorado, stretching like a mirage of hope before the eyes of those in the emigrant train. In that picture is given the most graphic story of the trials and the perseverance and the unconquerable spirit of the western pioneers. There in the mountain fastness, gathered about the old "prairie schooner," is the family circle, the foundation of our civilization; the mother with the babe at her breast, the children at play, the father with rifle in hand guarding his little flock, and the adventurous spirit of youth scaling the cliffs above the pass. There is the broken wagon and even the grave of one who has died in the struggle to reach the promised land. But the trials and discouragements have not broken the spirit of these pioneers, contesting with nature in their effort to scale the mountains, which your own Daniel Webster said should mark the limitations of this nation, and there was to have been planted the statue of the God Terminus, to remind the people, "Thus far and no farther."

It is such a picture as comparatively few now living can appreciate, for it is not merely the artist's fancy, but real history placed on canvas; the most romantic history of the West, worthy a place beside that of the Pilgrim's Landing, portraying incidents which brought out in best form the indomitable spirit of the American people. And the hope which then seemed to be but a mirage has become the most real, the most glorious part of our development. Those pioneers who went into the West created Commonwealths which are the most progressive and exhibit the most remarkable development under a people's government. To-day the great Middle West is the industrial center of the country, producing in manufactured product more than all of New England and New York and Pennsylvania combined, while the Pacific coast has developed into an empire of production such as was never dreamed of by the pioneers who crossed the continent in search of gold.

And now I want to see some artist, with a broad conception of this phenomenal development, paint another picture, gathering upon the canvas an allegorical presentation of this realization of the dreams and the hopes which inspired the pioneers portrayed by Leutze, the German-born painter, in that remarkable picture of *Westward the Course of Empire Takes its Way*.

## THE LIBERAL MOVEMENT.

The administration of Grant was opposed by the most remarkable coalition that was ever known in American politics. A body of men who were disappointed in the administration met in convention at Cincinnati and called themselves Liberal Republicans.

O men of the Middlesex Club, the Republican party, consisting of a majority of the people of the Republic, fighting the battles of the Republic under the leadership of that great party, contributed money by taxation to pay the expenses of constructing a navy such as made useless all the navies of the world. [Applause.] Beginning with Lincoln, and lasting from that time to this day, the policy of protection and all the policies of the Republican party have been in continuous operation for the prosperity and development of this country, except for a very short period which most men of my age and your age do not recall with pleasure. [Laughter.] Our great party has been glorious in history, magnificent in accomplishment, from its birth to the present time. [Applause.] It is still virile, still true to the country, to a government of the people; still helping to develop the resources of the country and to continue those policies under which was fought the greatest civil war that ever was waged in the tide of time. We have substantially paid the war debt, and we ever hold in grateful remembrance the men who wore the blue and had the highest post of honor in that great contest, constituting as they did one-third of the battle force of the Northland, while the other two-thirds were maintaining the Government and supporting the army. Since the close of that great war we have paid to the heroes who fought in the field and to their widows and orphans four thousand million dollars in pensions, thank God, and we will continue to remember their service and bravery until the last of them has answered to the final roll call. [Applause.]

The Republican party! It was good enough for a majority of the people, when certain men, on their own motion, got together at Cincinnati and named themselves Liberal Republicans; and in these days, when we have "progressive" Republicans, and "independent" Republicans, O men of the Middlesex Club, let us wipe the word "Republican" off our banners, and forget our party's glorious achievements in the past, before we add an adjective to the name Republican. [Prolonged applause.] The history of the Republican party in all its contests in the past proves to us that when somebody would attempt to improve the name "Republican," he has it in mind to delude genuine Republicans without having the courage to march over and join the Democratic party, as he ought. [Applause.] That is what one of your distinguished citizens has done. I honor him for his business ability and his correct habits of life. Once he answered to the name of Republican, but within the last two weeks has proclaimed in New York, as well as here, that he has found rest in the bosom of the Democracy, and he turned and exhorted those who were like unto him to follow his example and enlist under the flag which would tell the story of their policies.

In 1872 the Liberal Republicans nominated for President the most radical Republican the country had ever known, the high priest of Republicanism and protection, Horace Greeley, and for Vice-President, B. Gratz Brown. The Democratic convention became an echo, accepted candidates and platform of the Liberals, suppressing the iden-

tity of the Democratic party. Greeley was a radical protectionist, those who nominated him were free traders; Greeley had complained that Lincoln did not go fast enough in prosecuting the war and emancipating the slaves; they had declared the war was a failure. It was yoking the lion and the ass, with a platform that relegated to the people the one great economic issue on which the parties had always divided—the tariff. That platform said:

Recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their congressional districts and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation.

My God! suppose they had succeeded. What a revision that would have been. The convention was not a union of men thinking alike on political questions, but a coalition of men who had nothing in common except personal grievances and disappointments. There were great men in that movement, but they did not have great aspirations or great inspirations. They forgot the very first precept of a government of the people, a union on principles of government. They were opposing men, not advancing ideas. Greeley was most generous in accepting the promise of Democratic support. In his letter he spoke of “a new departure from jealousies, strifes, and hates into an atmosphere of peace, fraternity, and mutual good will,” and he assured his allies that he regarded them as even better Democrats than before, while he was no less a Republican than he ever had been. How history repeats itself. [Laughter.]

Where was the conversion? We were not permitted to know. Neither party to the coalition followed the example of Saul of Tarsus and acknowledged its conversion and changed its name. They did not see the light from heaven, but apparently from the Treasury. It was a coalition without any progressive principle, though it was heralded as a progressive movement. Its purpose in effect was to arrest progress, to check the reconstruction of the South, to stop the march toward resumption of specie payment, to halt the settlement of the war debt, to leave principles of government stagnant, and bicker over the trivial things in administration, with slander as the mainspring and scandal mongers for the leaders in a great national campaign. History repeats itself again. [Applause.]

#### THE PEOPLE WERE NOT FOOLED.

It would have been a serious reflection upon the sober sense and the intelligence of the American people if such a campaign had succeeded. It failed, more ignominiously than any other national political campaign ever before or since failed, and its failure taught a lasting lesson. Virile manhood does not form coalitions of radicalism and liberalism, of vitriol and soothing sirup, of Republicanism and Democracy. Men may change their political convictions, but they will not attempt to yoke up protection and free trade, sound money and fiat money, or sacrifice all principles of political government for a mere temporary victory and the occupation of office, or for petty revenge. Such coalitions have failed ever and should fail always. There is no political purgatory, no halfway house between political integrity and benevolent pretense. Any attempt of that kind is set down as demagoguery.

Emery A. Storrs, a brilliant lawyer in Chicago, fittingly characterized the coalition in these words:

I think that the counsel of a class of men who are unable to agree on anything except their antipathies, and have no harmony except in their dislikes, who agree upon nothing but opposition and are unable to agree upon any affirmative line of policy, is not likely to influence a great party.

And they were not.

The candidates of this coalition were both editors and the inspiration seems to have been a hope of securing control of the organs of publicity. In that hope and design they were very successful. Through Greeley, a strong protectionist, the New York Tribune, then the most powerful Republican paper in the United States, was brought to the support of the coalition, and its example was followed by other Republican papers, such as the Springfield Republican, the Chicago Tribune, the Cincinnati Commercial, then the most forceful Republican paper in Ohio. They made common cause for the coalitions with the New York World, the Evening Post, the Chicago Times, and substantially all the metropolitan papers in the West, save alone the Globe-Democrat of St. Louis, before the war, during the war, after the war, and from that time to this the one shining great exception which has been true to the policies of the Republican party in dark days and bright days. All honor to the Globe-Democrat. [Applause.]

#### A POWERFUL COMBINATION

It was a most formidable combination, these great papers having access to millions of readers, and their efforts were supplemented by those of such men as Senator Lyman Trumbull, Stanley Matthews, George Hoadley, David Dudley Field, Carl Schurz, Joseph Pulitzer, Horace White, Cassius M. Clay, George W. Julian, Edward Atkinson, David A. Wells, Theodore Tilton, and many others. It was a combination of those who controlled the Democratic party on the one hand with some of those who had been able and forceful in the Republican party on the other hand to deliver the Democratic party over solidly to Greeley and to disrupt the Republican party. Perhaps it was the most powerful combination of the leaders of the respective parties that has ever been formed in the history of the country.

In May, 1872, the metropolitan press of the country announced the dissolution of the Republican party and began to prepare its obituary. But the Republican party, organized by Lincoln, under whose leadership the Union had been preserved and the amendments to the Constitution adopted, believing in the policy of protection, and having written that policy into law, could not be controlled by leaders or by the press. The men who formed the combination reckoned without the great body of the people: they were not representing the people, but their own selfish ambitions. Those who made up the rank and file of the Republican party did not attempt to compromise with the enemies of the policies of their party, but, turning their faces to the foe, proclaimed anew their devotion to the economic principles of the Republican party.

The great body of the people treated these newspapers and other publications that undertook to deliver their readers over to the coalition as just so many individuals. They remained true to their convictions and true to the Republican party, and in November, 1872, Grant was

elected by the greatest popular vote and the greatest proportion of the electoral vote ever given to a President. The people gave a fitting and lasting illustration of the fact that the publisher of a great newspaper may have thousands of readers, but he can not destroy their political convictions or deliver their votes in the ballot-box. The American people did their own thinking at that time and will continue to do their own thinking in the future. (Applause.)

#### USURPERS CHARGED USURPATION.

After nearly forty years have passed, it is curious reading to turn back to the platform of that coalition and see such terms as "usurpation" and "treachery" hurled at the President, and then note that the so-called Liberal Republican convention was entirely self-constituted and represented nobody but the self-appointed delegates usurping the name of the party they were trying to destroy and the functions of a national convention, while the Democratic convention betrayed the Democratic party by surrendering to the so-called Liberal party, accepting its candidates and platform without the change of a word or a letter. The whole combination of Republican bolters, Democrats, and publishers, showed how blind men may become when they forget the representative character of our Government in its party conventions, as well as in the Congress and in the executive departments. But when we turn to the election returns and see how that coalition was repudiated by the voters at the polls, we are reminded of Lincoln's remark, that—

You can fool some of the people all the time; all the people some of the time; but you can't fool all the people all the time.

(Applause.)

There were faults in Grant's administration, as there would have been in any administration following that of President Johnson, which divided and demoralized the party in power, and these faults might have been pointed out and assailed by the properly constituted party convention that represented nearly one-half of the American people; but when the prosecutors of Grant demonstrated that they had no client the farce became so apparent that the campaign ended in ridicule.

In his memoirs Grant tells of an incident in his campaign in Texas, where one night the camp was disturbed by an unearthly noise that had a panicky effect on the soldiers and caused some uneasiness among the officers. A squad was detailed to make a reconnoissance. They stealthily moved in the direction from which the sounds came, and as the men rounded a butte they discovered two coyotes on little hillocks engaged in a serenade. The noise made by the Liberal and Democratic press against Grant was a fitting parallel to that episode in his early life. It did not frighten him nor the Republican rank and file who marched to the polls with the same determination they had four years before, and 600,000 more of them dropped Republican ballots into the boxes, many of these being Democrats, who took that method of repudiating the attempted betrayal of their leaders who had sought to deliver them to the pretense of a party that represented nothing but sound and fury. [Applause.] The presumptuous attempt to destroy the Republican party did destroy the coalition, and the man who had done so much to build up the Republican party and make its policies

dominant in the country, died of a broken heart before the electoral college met to tabulate the result.

#### A COALITION FOR FREE TRADE.

The real purpose of the coalition against Grant in 1872 was the overthrow of the protective policy. The Democrats in their convention of 1868, had declared for a tariff for revenue only, just as they have done ever since. The men who were most conspicuous in the Liberal convention were what were called "free traders," and were in harmony with the Democratic policy touching the tariff, and while both Liberals and Democrats in 1872 relegated the tariff question to the people in their congressional districts, in 1876 they were all for the old Democratic policy of free trade, as they have been from that time to the present, and as they are now. [Applause.]

When the Democratic party, through the aid of the mugwump element, came into control of the House of Representatives and the presidency in 1885, the Mills tariff bill was passed; but it failed of enactment because of the Republican Senate. When they secured full power in 1893, they enacted the Wilson law, repudiated by their President because it was not sufficiently radical, and yet it was sufficiently radical to cripple the industries of the country, close the factories, throw out of employment 3,000,000 laborers, and fail in producing revenue enough to carry on the Government, rendering it necessary for the Government to borrow \$265,000,000 for ordinary expenses. Here was the culmination of the long fight through the years against the protective policy, and its success was the greatest disaster that has ever come to the industries of the United States. [Applause.]

#### DINGLEY LAW BRINGS PROSPERITY.

The country, having had this object lesson, reversed itself, and in 1896 elected McKinley President and gave the Republican party full power in the House and Senate. Promptly that party wrote into the statutes of the United States the policy of protection, under which the country entered upon an era of unexampled progress and development, which has continued substantially to the present time. In this prosperity the wages of labor are increasing, and I have no doubt, in proper degree, will continue to increase. [Applause.]

The tariff act of 1909 is not perfect any more than were the numerous tariff acts that preceded it, and probably no better adapted to the conditions to-day than they were to the conditions which they were designed to meet. But the worth of the new law is to be measured by the conditions of industry and business since its enactment. We had unemployed men, we had idle freight cars, we had much uncertainty in many lines of business, and we had a large deficit in the Federal Treasury. Within eight months after the enactment of the Payne law this had all changed. We now have full employment, no idle cars, and the revenues are again ample to meet the expenditures of the Government. This is in marked contrast to the effects which followed the enactment of the Wilson tariff act of 1894, and so like those that followed the enactment of the Dingley Act of 1897, that it seems as good a justification, as good a promise for the future as we could have expected from any legislation that touches the whole busi-

ness of the country, which is one-third the business of the entire civilized world.

#### THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

A good many people complain of the high cost of living, and I will not say that it is exactly described by James J. Hill in his epigram of the cost of high living, but there has been a tendency throughout the century to live better, and each generation in this country has lived better than the one that preceded it, and that is the one great ideal for which we have labored through the years. I hope it will continue and that we can continue here to develop a better civilization than anywhere else in the world by protecting our labor and industry against the competition of the labor and industry in the more crowded parts of the earth. When anybody tells me that our labor is now no better off than the labor of Europe I look to Castle Garden and find the answer in the thousands of immigrants who come here every year and find employment and become a part of our civilization.

But we have other testimony from our American consular service, from the agents of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and from Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, to the effect that wages in America are double the wages in Europe, and that the cost of living is no higher here than there. I could weary you with details from these reports from those most interested in knowing the truth about this question, but I will not, except to quote a concluding sentence from the annual report of Mr. Gompers to the Federation of Labor after he made a personal tour of investigation in Europe. Mr. Gompers says:

If the immigrant of this country is willing to continue living here at the same level he was obliged to accept in his native land, he can find it for the same money.

He adds:

Meat is usually from 25 to 100 per cent higher in price than in the United States.

When this statement is coupled with a detailed comparison by Mr. Gompers of wage scales here with those for the same kind of labor in Europe, and the general conclusion that wages in America are double those in Europe, we can readily understand why the immigrant continues to come in spite of the statements that they can not improve their condition.

Down here in Massachusetts where you are building new factories, and running on full time those which were builded before, with increasing wages to your operatives, and where you are making fair profits, who are the men that are doing the labor in your factories? Are they your children, the children of the Puritan stock? Nay, nay. They are the foreign born, largely from Canada, a less number from Europe. They may be ignorant; they may be, part of them at times, uncomfortable, but in the United States, with a common-school system that daily instructs 18,000,000 of oncoming sovereigns at the public expense, costing almost \$400,000,000, four-tenths of all the money that is spent in all the world, civilized and uncivilized, for the purposes of education, as long as they come of the Caucasian race, willing to live in the sweat of their faces, with the example and inspiration of their brothers who have preceded them, the common schools in the future as in the past will, I believe, enable us to assimilate them, as

many of our forebears were assimilated, after they had crossed in the steerage from the old world to the new. We have ninety millions now. We had thirty millions when Lincoln was elected President.

After all our enormous expenditures, after we have lived as no people ever lived before in the history of the race, the savings from labor since 1860, in spite of these enormous burdens which we have borne, have increased from \$16,000,000,000 then to \$125,000,000,000 to-day, two-fifths of all the wealth of all the world. The Black Hander will come in and does come in. The Black Hander reads, the Black Hander writes. The anarchist may come in. He reads; he writes. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of ex-Governor Black here this evening. While I would continue to prevent contract labor from coming to our shores, and while I would shut out the pauper and the criminal, I would not shut out the capable and industrious Anglo-Saxon. I would shut out the Chinaman because of his habits and his capacity to live cheaply and because he does not bear the burdens of our civilization. If we did not shut him out, he would put us all out of business. [Laughter and applause.] If the world should take its hand off the Chinaman and let him come without regulation, he in his patient labor and his changeless orientalism would conquer the world.

So much for that. May I add one word? As I look into your faces I realize that many of those before me are descendants of the Pilgrims and of the Puritans. Many of you are not. Oh, how Massachusetts and New England have been like a benediction to that great West stretching beyond the Alleghenies to the Pacific coast! As a schoolboy in the log schoolhouse, my earliest knowledge of books was of Noah Webster's elementary spelling book. You never used it. Most of you do not know that it was the first modern schoolbook. In that western country that was our first book, beginning to spell a b ab, b-a ba, c-a-t cat, d-o-g dog, clear through until we came in the the final pages of that speller to those wonderful words like "incompatibility." We would begin, i-n in, c-o-m, com, incom. p-a-t pat, and so on, syllable by syllable, until we spelled it out and pronounced it. I do not think the later publishers have much improved on Noah Webster's elementary spelling book; but by paper, by magazine, by your good schools you became evangelists for the common school system. You gave us many of the best that you had.

As your high schools and your universities graduated them, like the course of empire, westward they took their way. You have mingled in that great West with the Scotch-Irish from Tennessee and North Carolina and Kentucky, and it has made a magnificent civilization. We feel grateful to you. And yet, Governor Black, while I agree with much you have said, and while I would by law and by the enforcement of the law more rigidly shut out and keep out the pauper, the criminal, and the diseased, yet when I recollect that my ancestors on one side crossed the Atlantic Ocean in what was worse than the steerage, before the days of steam, one hundred and fifty years ago, I am not willing, as long as we need the labor of the Caucasian race, to shut out those who honestly come here willing to work and partake of our civilization. [Applause.]

## THE RULES OF THE HOUSE.

I have been asked to say a word about the rules of the House—a word, after the ocean of words that have been hurled at the rules in the last two years.

Thomas B. Reed once said:—

The noise made by a small but loud minority in the wrong is too often mistaken for the voice of the people and the voice of God.

That remark applies to the discussion of the rules.

The rules are the development of one hundred and twenty years, and they are now substantially as they have been for a generation. Just twenty years ago we had a campaign of denunciation against these rules, and all that has been said in the last two years was said then. Then it was the “loud minority” trying to dictate legislation, as it is now. The Democrats were in the minority in the Fifty-first Congress, but they tried to dictate legislation. Speaker Reed, and the majority responsible for legislation, refused to be dictated to. Reed counted a quorum of those who were present for mischief, but declared they were not present for business. That action of Reed was denounced as “czarism.” The discussion became international, but the Supreme Court sustained Reed, and so did the Democratic party when it came into power. It adopted what it had denounced as the Reed rules, absolutely repudiating the denunciation it had written into its platforms in nearly every State in the Union. The rules had not been changed in any particular since they were used by the Democratic Fifty-third Congress until a year ago a new rule creating calendar Wednesday was adopted.

Why this fuss and fury? The old cause, the effort of the minority to rule. On the eve of the last Presidential election the Democratic leader sought to dictate legislation. The majority would not accept dictation. He began a filibuster which continued to the end of the session, frankly stating on the floor that the minority would resist and embarrass in every way possible all legislation, unless certain measures demanded by the minority should be brought forward. The Democratic platform denounced the czarism of the Speaker, just as the Democratic platforms did in 1890. The minority had demanded legislation for special interests, not for the general interest. There were other special interests demanding that the Speaker use arbitrary power in their behalf. When he refused to violate the rules and traditions of the House he was denounced a “czar.”

When we have to change the rules to permit the minority to dictate legislation in behalf of special interests, we will be confronted with the necessity of changing our Constitution and all our conceptions of a people's government, where the majority shall legislate and accept responsibility for the legislation.

We are told in Holy Writ that the Creator made Adam out of clay, and he still remained clay until the Creator breathed the breath of life into his nostrils and he became man. The Committee on Rules is the machinery of the House, to report special orders, or for change of rules. The resolution from that committee might be likened unto Adam, and is not worth the paper on which it is written until a majority of the House, by a vote, has breathed the breath of life into it so that it becomes a rule of the House. It was so in the past; it is so now.

One word in conclusion. I am a believer in organization of men for lawful purposes. You have the copartnership, you have the corporation. If you could prevent both of them now by law, the civilization of the people would turn back a hundred years. I believe in organization in the church, the Free Masons, the Odd Fellows, all the benevolent societies. I believe in club organization; and in the changing conditions of production, if I lived in the sweat of my face I would cooperate with my brothers, always keeping the law, so that we might united make contracts with those who employed us, to our best advantage. I say always under the law. I heartily endorse what Governor Black has said, and will add a single sentence: All men are equal under the law, whether they be rich or poor. Like the grace of God, the law covers all and protects all, and if this civilization fails, it will fail because the demagogue on one hand, or selfish and powerful interests on the other seek class legislation and different laws for one from what we have for all. [Applause.] While all men are equal before the law, all men are not equal physically or mentally. The insane asylum, the home for the feeble minded, the brethren who fall by the wayside, all are evidences of that. It is our duty to care for all these at the common expense, and we have made great progress in a hundred years along that line. For some wise reason, under the operation of universal law made by the Almighty when he created matter, the human animal works out his own salvation.

We can not tell why all of us are not 6 feet 4 inches high, and why we do not all weigh 200 pounds, and why we do not live for a thousand years, but we do not. We take conditions as we find them and under this law work out our salvation. And when somebody attacks the church of John Knox, or when somebody who belongs to the Methodist Church, or to the mother church, walks out and denounces all those with whom he formerly consorted as corrupt, and says that he alone has the live wire to the great white throne, or when somebody forsakes the concrete wisdom of all the ages, as developed in the experience of a people who are competent, and growing more competent, to govern themselves, and says: "I am wiser and better than all the rest of you," and flocks by himself and proclaims, as I have frequently heard them, that "God and one are a majority," I always feel like saying, "My poor, simple friend, did you ever stop to think that God is a majority without one?" [Applause and laughter.]

They proclaim that the Republican party next November is to go to the bow wows. My honored colleague, the leader of the minority [Mr. Clark, of Missouri], a giant in stature, a good-tempered man, now, as for nearly twenty years past, prances up and down the aisles of the House every week and informs us that "Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin" is written on the wall, and that we have been weighed in the balance and found wanting, and that his party is to be clothed with power. When he was telling us that the other day in the House I was reminded of that Sunday-school story: The teacher was telling to a class of bright-eyed little boys the story of David and Goliath, how old Goliath strutted out before the armies of the living God and sent his defiance; and one little sharp-eyed boy said, "Skip that, ma'am, he's a blowin'!" [Laughter.]

The Republican party has temporarily, from time to time, in various States and in the country, gone to partial or complete defeat; but I say to the men of New England, as I will say later on to the men of

the Middle West, "Keep the faith." Our policies have demonstrated that they are right. When our party was born there were no settlements west of the Missouri River. It was a stretch of desert and mountains. Under our policies of protection and development commonwealths have sprung into existence as if by magic. Keep the faith. Brave men, as individuals and in the aggregate, in the affairs of life, in cloudy days as well as in bright days, close up the ranks as some weak or dissatisfied brother drops out, and move on. We had better keep the faith, and fighting fail, than to have a victory that will give us another House of Representatives and another Senate of the United States like unto the present House and Senate, where no man can tell from day to day whether the Republican party has a majority or not. We had better fight and fail, than to fight and win and have the victory, like dead sea fruit, turn to ashes on our lips. [Prolonged applause.]

A TOAST TO GRANT.

Gentlemen, the life of Grant was a valuable one to this country for what he did in the years of our Government's greatest peril. He helped save the Union and assisted in establishing the Republic on an enduring basis. Since that time, under the policies of his party, your party, and my party, the wealth of the country has been multiplied by eight, the agricultural product by six, and the manufactured product has been multiplied by ten. This is the result of the wise economic policy of Lincoln which came in with the salvation of the Union and the establishment of free labor everywhere in the land.











LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 002 358 130 9